

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**The Present Invention and the Pending Claims*

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14, 17-21, and 24-28 are currently pending and are directed to a photosensitive resin composition (claims 1, 4-8, 11, 12, 26, and 27), a photosensitive resin composition layer (claim 13), and a photosensitive resin printing original plate (claims 14, 17-21, 24, 25, and 28).

Summary of the Claim Amendments

The elements of claim 3 have been added to claim 1, and claims 3 and 16 have been canceled as superfluous. Claim 6 has been amended to recite that component (E) is a carboxylic acid copolymer. Claim 13 has been amended to recite that the cosolvent comprises isopropyl alcohol and n-propyl acetate in a weight ratio of 8:2, as supported by the specification at, for example, page 21, line 24, through page 22, line 2. Claims 9, 10, 15, 22, and 23 have been canceled. The phrase “(G) a conjugated diene oligomer having no photopolymerizable crosslinking group” has been deleted from claim 27. New claim 28 has been added as supported by the specification at, for example, page 5, line 24, through page 6, line 2. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 15 is objected to. Claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 19, 22, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11-14, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent 6,197,479). Claims 3, 4, 16, 17, and 26 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Reconsideration of the pending claims is hereby requested.

Discussion of the Claim Objection

Claim 15 is objected to for improperly depending on canceled claim 2. To expedite prosecution, claim 15 has been canceled, thereby rendering the claim objection moot.

Discussion of the Written Description Rejection

Claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 19, 22, 23, and 27 allegedly fail to comply with the written description requirement. The bases of the written description rejection are discussed below.

The phrase “a copolymer comprising a carboxylic acid comonomer” in claims 6 and 19 allegedly is not supported by the specification’s disclosure of “carboxylic acid-based copolymer.” Claim 6 (on which claim 19 is dependent) has been amended to recite that component (E) is a “carboxylic acid copolymer.” Applicants note that the Office Action issued September 29, 2008, states: “The addition of the word ‘based’ to an otherwise definite expression extends the scope of the expression so as to render it indefinite.” (page 4, item 7). In view of this statement, Applicants believe that the amendment to claim 6 overcomes the indefiniteness rejection because the phrase “carboxylic acid copolymer,” which the Office considers to be definite, is used without the term “based.”

The Office objects to the phrase “a conjugated diene oligomer having no photopolymerizable crosslinking group” in claims 9, 10, 22, 23, and 27. To expedite prosecution, claims 9, 10, 22, and 23 have been canceled. Further, the phrase “(G) a conjugated diene oligomer having no photopolymerizable crosslinking group” has been deleted from claim 27.

With respect to claim 13, the Office contends that the specification does not support a mixture of any ratio of isopropyl alcohol and n-propyl acetate, but rather only supports an 8:2 mixture (page 21, line 24, through page 22, line 2). Claim 13 has been amended to recite a weight ratio of 8:2.

In view of the claim amendments, Applicants submit that each of the written description rejections has been overcome.

Discussion of the Anticipation Rejection

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11-14, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 25 allegedly are anticipated by Tanaka et al.

Claim 3 is not subject to the anticipation rejection but rather is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The elements of claim 3 have been added to claim 1. Claims 5, 7, 8, 11-14, 18, 20, 21, 24, and 25 are dependent on claim 1. As a result, the anticipation rejection has been rendered moot.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John Kilyk, Jr., Reg. No. 30763
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: August 19, 2009